

Safety and Aesthetics in Urban Roadway Design
Interdisciplinary Group Meeting
May 13, 2004, 9:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.
WSDOT Lakewood Maintenance Facility - Conference Room

Members in attendance:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Dave Olson	WSDOT – HQ Design Office	360-705-7952
Al King	County Road Administration Board	360-664-3299
Anna St. Martin	WSDOT – HQ Design Office	360-705-7453
Mark Maurer	WSDOT – HQ Design Office	360-705-7242
Rich Meredith	City of Shoreline	206-546-2403
Ted Focke	WSDOT – HQ Design Office	360-705-7270
Bruce Smith	WSDOT – HQ Env. Services Office	360-705-7493
Sally Anderson	WSDOT – NW Region	360-440-4501
Brian Walsh	WSDOT – H & LP	360-705-7387
Don Peterson	FHWA – Olympia	360-534-9323
Kathy Wolf	University of Washington	206-616-5758
Samih Shilbayeh	WSDOT – HQ Design Office	360-705-7264

Welcome and Introduction:

Dave Olson welcomed everyone to the meeting and requested that the attendees introduce themselves. He gave a brief history on the document's development from the time when Nancy Boyd started it, then under Brian Hasselbach's leadership, and the gap from November to February when review comments were incorporated by Anna St. Martin. He mentioned that we have recovered momentum and are focusing on completion of the document with the contribution of a new staff member, Samih Shilbayeh. Since the last IDG meeting in November, several chapters were added and review comments were incorporated.. There was a discussion about the "Safety, Aesthetics, and Community Partnerships" flowchart and that there is a need to check on the status of Arterial Guidance Development Advisory Group, Mark Maurer will look into this.

Status of Document:

There was a concern about how the document will get used. Dave speculated that readers may go first to the Table of Contents and the introduction and then go to the case studies, and lastly read the portions of the text that are relevant to their current area of interest.

Al King was originally envisioning a 20-30-page document identifying the things to consider in any urban design situation and would like to have a summary document. He also questioned the need for this detailed document and if it will be used. Dave: will review in June, and may address concerns through an executive summary.

Don Peterson was wondering about an element the document does not have with respect to context sensitive solution language used in the Federal DOT efforts. Dave mentioned that we are anticipating CSD, CSS titles and language will have a short life span. We

want to embody the concepts of CSD or CSS in this document, but not get too closely tied to that terminology.

Al King suggested a summary document approach by summarizing the scope of each chapter. Al King will take a stab at reformatting some of the contents such as divisions III and VI.

Group suggested addressing everything in executive summary.

Dave asked the group how many of them had had an opportunity to look at the new chapters. The general response was that since the chapter distribution, no-one had enough time to look over much of the content. Dave requested that IDG members review the new materials within the next couple of weeks.

There is a perception that the document has the look of a WSDOT document and that many of the local agency team members don't feel enough ownership to want their name on it. Dave asked if this was partly due to loss of momentum as the project leadership role changed. There was some discussion about the process and the role of the IDG as the guidance group for content of the document

Rich Meredith commented that the tone of the document is an issue. For example Figure II-1.1 seems to imply that some design features are less desirable than others (Each has advantages and disadvantages or in other words tradeoffs). He was asking what the consequences would be if changes occur, such as changes in lane width. He suggested a closer balance between the tradeoffs. He will send some comments on a new approach.

Chapter IV-9 Stormwater Management

Mark Maurer went over his new chapter. Stormwater Management, Chapter IV-9 of the manual, gives a short overview of why stormwater management is important in urban areas. It introduces Low Impact Development (LID) techniques and how to better fit traditional stormwater facilities into the landscape. During the discussion of the chapter there was a recommendation that maybe this chapter can be combined with some of the elements of the Green Streets chapter or at least reference that chapter since it covers LID techniques as well. There was also a recommendation to move this to the Environmental Considerations chapter.

There was a suggestion about combining Green Street Chapter with Vegetation chapter (IV-10-6) and also combine these chapters with the Environmental Considerations chapter.

Chapter IV-13 Roadside Amenities

The Roadside Amenities chapter discusses the role of street furniture, artwork, and other elements on the roadside and consideration for their use. There was a discussion of funding for these items and that the Funding Matrix needs to be referenced in this chapter. The option of including it in its entirety in an appendix was also discussed,

though due to the complications of updating the Matrix it was agreed that this may not be appropriate. Some more photos need to be added to show examples. There is a need to refer to the funding Matrix within the document or list it as a reference.

Chapter IV-13, Don Peterson mentioned that there is repetition of government regulations and directional document.

Chapter II-3 Environmental Partnerships

Bruce Smith talked about Chapter II-3, Environmental Partnerships, he mentioned that this chapter illustrated some examples about environmental enhancement and examples of mitigation needs and proceeding with other agencies. There is a need to show tradeoff for Figures II-3.3. There was a suggestion that some of the examples be moved to the case study section of the document.

Chapter X-2 Pedestrian Component

Brian Walsh stated that he wanted to get the reader to think about master plan, core studies, etc. There was a discussion about Figure X-1.1, which needs some discussion about tradeoffs within chart.

Al King asked to take out the definitions in the stormwater management section and cut the introduction in half because it duplicates what is covered elsewhere. Target audience may be traded with an interest in transportation not designers. Redundancy noted between *Governing Regulations and Directional Documents* and *Additional Resources*: same documents listed in both. Change Bruce Smith Env. Partnership section so it reads like “we partner with each other to meet our respective environmental needs.” Add a table of points to consider (tradeoffs) vs. tab potential results section, move the examples to case studies.

Chapter X-1 Bicycle facilities:

Al King commented that this reads like how to design facilities, and we need to point out the tradeoffs of providing different types of facilities (separate facilities in a rural setting vs. combined) let the references get people to the detailed info. Figure X-1.1 doesn't present the tradeoffs (short walking distance, etc)

Pedestrian and Bicycle discussion:

What are the tradeoffs for putting bikes in rural areas, one should think about facilities improvement, safety, and define the choices.

What elements to consider and how to deal with bicycle elements, accommodate trails based on speed. Need to add FHWA references in this chapter.

Case studies:

Samih talked about various case studies of projects implemented throughout the state and how the local and state agencies collaborated to deliver these projects. During the project development processes, issues such as main street revitalization plans and improving environmentally sensitive areas were addressed. An example mentioned was the US 395

roundabout at Colville. Samih and Brian Walsh talked about the scope of the project, the challenges presented in developing the final product.

Group comments included:

- There is a need to reference case studies within the document content.
- Add Indian Creek example as a case study.
- Al King: identify the conflicting interests that led to the tradeoff involved.
- May only need 3 case studies that are representative of the project development process, inclusive of tradeoffs. Also, you may benefit from moving them to the front of the document.
- Al King: the document should not be a design document but instead a document that lets people identify the design features to include in a project.
- There was discussion on the need for a disclaimer that the projects were all unique in some way and may not be appropriate for other locations. After discussion the group determined that including a disclaimer was not appropriate, instead they recommended that project descriptions present the unique features and elements incorporated in the project to address the specific site conditions.

Training updates:

Dave mentioned that the consultant who is going to teach the class (Context Sensitive Solutions) is CH2M Hill. We are in the process of finalizing the contract to offer 6 training sessions throughout the WSDOT regions. The first training course will be in September, probably in the NW Region (Seattle area), the training will be for WSDOT and local agency staff with a class size of 30 people per class. FHWA is offering the same training class by CH2M for state and local agencies. The next FHWA training is a 2-day class scheduled for June 8th - 9th in the Olympia area.

Funding matrix:

Mark Maurer talked about the Urban Funding Matrix for WSDOT Capital Projects and how to use it. He is drafting a document with some instructions on how to use the matrix and has worked together with the FHWA and locals to try to present a clear understanding on who is paying for what.

Guest Speaker:

Kathy Wolf, a social scientist at the University of Washington who does research in urban forestry, presented the preliminary results of a research project. The purpose of the study is to better understand the relationship between roadside trees, and accident incidence and severity in urban settings. This information may be helpful to Context Sensitive Design collaborators as both community and agency stakeholders weigh the risks of roadside design choices that include trees. Analysis of national GES accident data for the year 2002 yields the following results:

About 2/3 of accidents occur in rural areas (admittedly this may vary by state) and 2/3 of off-road tree collisions occur in rural areas. Severe (incapacitating) injury occurs in 12%

of accidents, fatalities in 1% of accidents. 10% of all accidents are fixed object collisions, then about a 1/3 of those collisions (including tree impacts) result in severe injury. Additional analysis will generate a predictive model showing relationships between accident outcomes and driver and roadside traits.

Schedule for future effort:

Dave asked if having another meeting before sending the document to WSDOT statewide review would help. Team members said yes. Samih will plan another meeting in 2-3 weeks with the focus on participation of IDG members from local agencies. Samih will send an email to IDG to see what dates fit group schedule. May 28 was established as a turn-in date for the next round of review comments. Once the review is completed, the document is scheduled for statewide review around the middle of July and final review by expert technical writer then publication and distribution toward the end of August to be used as a reference when first session of training starts in September.

General Discussion:

- Kathy Wolf: to clarify responsibilities, suggestion to move legal responsibility piece up front. Kathy will provide more feedback on the document.
- Dave Olson: We may reorder the sequence of various sections based on the contents.
- Rich: add revision dates for each chapter on a status spreadsheet to keep track of changes and updates.
- Anna asked for illustrations to be used to clarify some of the concepts presented in the document. She shared with the group a summary of document illustrations needed by chapter. Rich Meredith and Don Peterson will provide some needed illustrations.

Wrap Up: Given the announcement under the “Miscellaneous” section, the next IDG meeting will be scheduled and announced in the future.

Action Items:

- Samih and Anna will continue updating web site for items that were not discussed in this meeting. The web link is

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/eesc/design/Urban/ArterialDesignGuidanceDevelopmentadvisorygroup.htm>

- IDG members need to complete comments on document and return to Samih Shilbayeh by May 28 (before the next meeting in 2-3 weeks.) Comments may be submitted either electronically or paper based (please send only the pages containing comments). The paper based comments may be sent to Dave Olson at the address below:
Dave Olson, WSDOT Design Office
PO Box 47329 Olympia, WA 98504-7329
- Members may submit any suggestions for items discussed for new Section to Samih Shilbayeh.
- Next meeting is expected to be the last meeting; it will be around middle of June. Samih will keep IDG members updated on the date and location.

Meeting adjourn at 2:30 pm